



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,225	12/14/2000	R. Dean Adams	BUR920000192US1	6368

7590 04/24/2003

IBM Microelectronics
Intellectual Property Law
1000 River Street
972 E
Essex Junction, VT 05452

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

LAMARRE, GUY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	4

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/737,225	ADAMS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Guy J. Lamarre, P.E.	2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

0. The Applicant's substitute Abstract and Claim (paper #3), submitted 6 Apr. 2001 in compliance with 37 CFR 1.75(h), has been entered.

0.1 Pursuant to 35 USC 131, **Claim 1** is presented for examination.

Reassignment Affecting Application Location

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2133.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because it is not clear what follows "remaining" on page 5 last line. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.0 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.1 **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Applicants' Admitted prior art** (hereinafter **Admitted prior art**) in view of **Gans** (US Patent No. 6,507,924; DATE-FILED: Feb. 17, 1998).

As per **Claim 1**, **Admitted prior art** substantially discloses, on page 2 lines 1-15, an equivalent method for testing a memory set having means for data write and data read and made

Art Unit: 2133

up of plural rows and columns, along with means to access said memory to apply test stimuli thereto via row selection of a cell, unique data pattern write and read operations.

Not specifically described in detail in **Admitted prior art** is the step for provision of circuitry for the data read and data write to have different widths.

However, Gans, in an analogous art, discloses a "*Method and apparatus for testing SRAM memory cells*" wherein a write driver is configured to vary data read and data write pulses so as to vary voltage application rate as shown, e.g., in Fig. 6 and col. 7 line 44 et seq.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the data access operations in **Admitted prior art** by including therein the technique of varying the length of data read and data write pulses, as taught by **Gans**, because such modification would provide the data access operations of **Admitted prior art** with an advantageous algorithm whereby a "*voltage margin test detects memory cells 10 that may fail upon the occurrence of slight variations in the voltages or write pulse widths t_{WPW} of data signals on the digit lines DL and DL during normal write operations. In the test mode write driver circuit 50, the rate at which the voltage on one of the digit lines DL and DL goes low during the test write mode may be adjusted by varying the reference voltages developed by the reference voltage circuits 68 and 86 as well as varying the characteristics of the transistors 64 and 78.*" {See **Gans**, Id., col. 7 line 67 et seq.}

3.2 The Examiner points out that the preamble in regards to differing data access widths is not supplemented positively by the ensuing limitations: Claim language reflecting routine of Applicants' Fig. 2 would cure such need.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

4.1 Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238, (for After-Final communications),

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry),

(703) 746-5463 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Guy J. Lamarre, P.E., whose telephone number is (703) 305-0755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert De Cady, can be reached on (703) 305-9595.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Guy J. Lamarre, P.E

Guy J. Lamarre

Patent Examiner

19 April 2003
